



CITY OF BURLINGTON, VERMONT
CITY COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION, ENERGY &
UTILITIES COMMITTEE

c/o Department of Public Works
645 Pine Street, Suite A
Post Office Box 849
Burlington, VT 05402-0849

802.863.9094 VOX
802.863.0466 FAX
802.863.0450 TTY
www.dpw.ci.burlington.vt.us

Councilor Kurt Wright, Chair WARD 4
Councilor Vince Brennan WARD 3
Councilor David Hartnett WARD 4

Inquiries:
Nicole Losch
802.865.5833 DIRECT
nlosch@ci.burlington.vt.us

Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee of the City Council

Thursday, September 15, 2011 at 5:00 PM

645 Pine Street, front conference room

–MINUTES–

Members present: Chair, Kurt Wright
David Hartnett
Vince Brennan

Others present: noted below

Chair Wright called the meeting to order at 5:07 pm.

1. Agenda

Hartnett moved to accept. Brennan second. All in favor.

2. Public Forum

Phil Hammerslough: Local Motion member & Burlington Walk Bike Council (BWBC) steering committee member. Provides secure bike parking, supports Colchester Ave project & 25 mph proposal. Requested bike lane on North Willard north of North Street; cited tourism draw and Bicycle Friendly Community status.

Roger Cole: Ward 3 resident. Supports 25 mph proposal. 8 year push for lower speed on College St. Speed limits discussed at NPA, all were enthusiastic, encouraged Police Dept. (BPD) involvement at hearing, need enforcement, ticket revenue can help city.

Gretchen Stokes: led petition for Battery St crosswalks. Supportive of DPW's plans for fall efforts on issue. Doesn't support DPW's in-street sign policy, but working with BPD for in-street sign maintenance.

Matt Conger: Ward 2. Supports 25 proposal, a multimodal focus. Need more striping/markings on bike lanes but need consistency to ensure safety. Cited sharrows vs. buffered lane vs yellow lane. Also supports Complete Streets.

Steve Norman: Local Motion member & BWBC steering committee member. Bikes & drives. Supports Colchester Ave project & hopes for same on North Ave. Supports 25

mph proposal. Slower speeds shows care for the city. Thanked all Councilors for French resolution support.

3. Minutes of 8/10/2011

Brennan moved to accept. Hartnett second. All in favor.

4. Burlington Downtown Transit Center – Aaron Frank, CCTA

Frank: April 2011 transferred funding from DPW to CCTA through Federal Transit Authority. DTC is biggest challenge to ridership. Ridership is increasing: from 2 to 9 LINK routes, 30% increase on Essex route w/ 15 min. service. Current DTC was built for 3 buses; began service with 7, has always been underbuilt. Church St. crossing is challenging. Have new shelters downtown. No driver breakroom or public bathroom. Shelters can be moved. Two-thirds trips start/stop in Burlington; one-third of riders go downtown. Are targeting drivers to become riders, resulted in 63% increase in riders & 43% on LINK. Needs for DTC: full shelter, compare to airport; indoor ticketing; heat; restrooms; electronic updates; driver's rooms = 2000 s.f. passenger area & 1600 s.f. breakroom = 60,000 s.f. total. Could be on- or off-street. Plan: CCTA Board, consulting team, Advisory board (CCTA, CCMPO, CEDO, City Council, Vtrans, Marketplace, 2 riders). Economic changes since DPW's site study. New look at all sites. Schedule: June 2011 start, 9/11/11 public meeting, end of 2011 have site selected. Following Federal process: scope, purpose & need, etc. Looking at examples from other cities. Construction planned for 2015.

Hartnett: don't think small. Expect significant ridership increase, so plan for that. It's long overdue.

Brennan: thanked CCTA for their work.

Roger Cole: driver on advisory board?

Frank: will have separate meetings with drivers. Can't have too many drivers on the board, and hard to choose just one.

Chapin Spencer, CCTA Board: Appreciates TEUC support. Larger plan = larger space. Needs political support. Last time was difficult. Early feedback on sites from Council & need TEUC to communicate with full Council.

Wright: next visit to TEUC?

Frank: Can present sites to TEUC. Sites are challenging because downtown is healthy.

Sharon Bushor, City Council: one downfall of 1st process was timing. Schedule should be reasonable & keep all involved.

Wright: info to full Council and public early on, but not a prolonged process.

Hartnett: encouraged CCTA to put drivers on advisory board. Doesn't want staff to end up not supporting plan.

Frank: Also comment on Colchester Ave item. CCTA has been involved in process and fully support 3-lane configuration.

5. Colchester Avenue Corridor Study – Colchester Avenue Task Force, Eleni Churchill (CCRPC) & Sharon Bushor (City Council)

Churchill & Bushor: Overview of Corridor Plan. Additional Task Force members in attendance. 2004 Council created Task Force to create visions and recommendations for corridor; fed into Corridor Study. Task Force = steering committee/advisory board of Corridor Study. Also in Transportation Plan. Corridor Study looks at current & future conditions. Began in January 2010. Final Study available October 14, 2011. Will be reviewed & approved by full Council. Fall 2010 demonstration project gave data to Corridor Study along with future analysis to 2030. 3 public meetings. Draft is online, comments taken through 9/30/11. Vision from Task Force and public meetings: Complete Street, mobility for all, access to variety of uses. Western segment option 1: 3 lane with advance pedestrian phase, bike lanes, greenbelt sidewalk; option 2 for 4 lanes with exclusive pedestrian phase, bike lanes, greenbelt, sidewalk – FAHC entrance needs additional right-of-way for left turn lane (5 lane section). 2030 travel time = eastbound 1.7 seconds slower for 3 lane and westbound 9.1 seconds slower for 3 lane. 3 lane does have longer queues. Corridor has sharp peaks, rest of the day has less traffic. Analysis is on peak. Demo project showed no traffic diversion, longer queues, minimal change in speed. Task Force recommends 3 lane with advance pedestrian phase. Additional scoping would happen with Pearl/Prospect, East Ave (proposal keeps parking), mid-block at Trinity with LED flashers. Eastern segment: fewer cars, still Complete Street vision. Bike lanes vs. green space. Wide curb lane isn't ideal, so propose mix of green pockets/parking pockets. Riverside intersection is #1 crash location in state. Plan to create just 1 intersection. Transit service: decrease number of stops and providers, add shelters. Recommend: 3 lane option, minor adjustments. Year 1 implementation: 25 mph speed limit, University Pl. right in/right out, no right turn on red at FAHC, ambulances to use Beaumont Pl only, review signal timing, transit consolidation study. 1-5 year plan: add missing sidewalk, consolidate transit, repair all sidewalks, mid-block crossing. 5-10 year plan: intersection scoping, complete infrastructure upgrades. Totals \$11 million for capital, no right of way included.

Wright: funding? From the city?

Churchill: safety funding possible for intersections. Details in plan.

Bushor: Since 2004 tried to be inclusive in process. Have been successful. Pilot could have ended in 2010 but prolonged for more process, feedback, seasonal review. DPW received largely positive comments. Council received regular feedback, changed with time. Was concerned with 3 lane & advanced pedestrian timing but supports plan and understands it all better. Fire Dept. supported but concerned with Pearl St queue and delay when running without siren; no service delay and attended all meetings. Should pave 3 lane now. Pearl/Prospect is priority project, work with UVM. Mid block is a priority project. Should keep parking on East Ave for India House and limited parking for older homes. Mill Street: DPW will work with residents and businesses to discuss exit to Barret St.

Steve Goodkind, DPW Director: addressing cost, implementation will be in phases, not one \$11 mil. Project.

Brennan: sidewalks are bad. Where are they in DPW's plan?

Losch: Sidewalk update later in agenda.

Wayne Senville, resident: priority to realign Pearl/Prospect. Very well written plan. Good work by consultant, MPO, DPW staff. 3 lane needs bus pullouts; recommended in plan, CCTA supports. 3 lane is cost effective.

Hartnett: good feedback on need for parking at East Ave. Priority for Pearl/Prospect and Riverside.

Matt Conger, resident: bike lane at East Ave?

Churchill, Goodkind & Spencer: permanent bike lane in plan, temporary ramp to path

Brennan: considered bridge for pedestrians?

Bushor: 2004 plan discussed "pie in the sky" ideas, but cost prohibitive

Churchill: mid block was identified to be okay solution

Brennan: right turn only out of Mill St?

Churchill: will consider in scoping.

Goodkind: will add, maybe remove one, crossing at Colchester/East Ave.

6. Waterfront North – Kirsten Merriman Shapiro, CEDO
Shapiro: ARRA contract awards in fall 2011; completion by July 2013. Funding: ANR low impact development stormwater = \$33,000. Pending notice on other grants. Tax Incremental Financing/Waterfront Improvement District pending.
7. TIGER3 Grant – Kirsten Merriman Shapiro, CEDO
Shapiro: Previous 2 rounds to Waterfront North. Considering Round 3 with Local Motion and Parks & Recreation Dept., October 31 deadline. 20% match now required. Still discussing how complete application is and need match. Look for ways to boost economic impact and job creation, marathon and triathlon examples. Surveying adjacent businesses. \$10-26 million range for TIGER projects. Bike Path Feasibility study showed project is within that range. TIF district analysis would give \$1.3 million after Waterfront North in 2024; possible match, if not depleted. Consider bond for path renovation for match. TEUC/Council to consider resolution to support March ballot for bond vote to show competitive application? Have initial analysis to provide at future meeting, but needs quick turnaround
Wright: schedule meeting in early October, provide numbers in advance.
8. BED Smart Grid – Barbara Grimes, Burlington Electric
 Tabled at request of presenter.
9. Sidewalk Strategic Plan and 5 year workplan – Nicole Losch, DPW
 Tabled until next meeting.
10. Staniford Road / Bike Path – Nicole Losch, DPW
Losch: following TEUC request at previous meeting, DPW will create improvement plan for crossing. Could have draft at next meeting.
11. Battery Street/Sherman Street Crosswalks – Nicole Losch, DPW

Losch: DPW planning late fall evaluation.

Brennan: traffic in/out seems to be a problem. Could have 2 lanes in, 1 out in AM and switch for PM?

Losch: Battery Street scheduled for Complete Street Corridor Study in future years. Could include in that process.

12. 25 mph Citywide Speed Limit Public Hearing – Nicole Losch, DPW

Losch: public hearing scheduled for September 28, 2011.

Chapin Spencer: increase in fatality rates with increase speed. Resolution from 2000 identifying speeding issue as priority. TEUC to please contact Public Works Commission to relay support for proposal.

Wright: schedule October meeting after 10/3. Would need resolution for 10/17/11 Council meeting to meet TIGER deadline.

13. Adjourn

Hartnett moved to adjourn. Brennan second. All in favor.

Adjourned at 6:55 pm.



Office of Planning
645 Pine Street, Suite A
Burlington, VT 05402
802.863.9094 P
802.863.0466 F
802.863.0450 TTY

www.dpw.ci.burlington.vt.us

Memo

Steven Goodkind, P.E.
Director of Public Works
City Engineer

Date: November 4, 2011

To: Transportation, Energy and Utility Committee

From: Nicole Losch, Transportation Planner / Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Manager

Subject: CCTA Board alternate

CC: Chapin Spencer and Bethany Whitaker, Burlington representatives, CCTA Board of Commissioners

In September 2011, the current CCTA Board representatives for Burlington – Chapin Spencer and Bethany Whitaker – requested the TEUC appoint an alternate representative for Burlington. The alternate could be an individual or a designated position within the City of Burlington staff.

With several important efforts underway at CCTA – hiring a General Manager, merging with former GMTA communities, and selecting a location for a Downtown Transit Center – this is an important time to ensure Burlington's representation at the CCTA Board meetings.

CCTA forwarded their bylaws regarding the appointment of representatives:

"The legislative body of any member municipality may appoint one alternate for each Board member it appoints to the Board of Commissioners. The appointed alternate may attend meetings and vote in the Board member's absence but will not have the ability to run as an Officer. Alternates attending meetings in the absence of a voting Board member will count toward fulfilling the definition of quorum as outlined in Article 3, Section 7 of the CCTA By-Laws. The term for alternates shall run concurrently with the term of the Board member for whom they were appointed."

RECOMMENDATION

The Department of Public Works has an inherent focus on transportation planning and, through the Transportation Plan, has a charge to track progress indicators that will lead the city to fulfill its vision for Burlington's transportation system. Several of these indicators are directly related to transit and CCTA's work. Therefore, we recommend that the TEUC request the City Council to appoint the City Engineer/his designee as an alternate for CCTA's Board of Commissioners.



Office of Planning
645 Pine Street, Suite A
Burlington, VT 05402
802.863.9094 P
802.863.0466 F
802.863.0450 TTY

www.dpw.ci.burlington.vt.us

Steven Goodkind, P.E.
Director of Public Works
City Engineer

Memo

Date: September 9, 2011
To: Transportation, Energy and Utility Committee
From: Nicole Losch, Bicycle, Pedestrian & Environmental Planner
Subject: Sidewalk Strategic Plan – history and 5 year work plan

History

In 2008-2009, DPW developed a Sidewalk Strategic Plan (SSP). Prior to development of the Sidewalk Plan, funding was allocated evenly by Ward and improvements were compiled and scheduled in response to complaints.

To improve our sidewalk program, our goals were:

1. Identify an acceptable condition for our sidewalks
2. Lower the life cycle of our system by increasing the number of miles improved each year
3. Use the most efficient methods for installation
4. Coordinate projects with other right-of-way improvements to increase efficiency
5. Utilize alternative funding sources to construct new sidewalk
6. Move toward a more pro-active planning process
7. Increase the commitment to curb and greenbelt restoration
8. Meet American's with Disabilities Act (DAA) requirements, walkability goals, and current standards

To develop the SSP, we recruited volunteers and inventoried our entire 150-mile sidewalk network; this information became our Sidewalk Deficiency Index. Our sidewalk inventory gave all deficiencies equal priority* and included:

Possible hazards & deficiencies:

(only counts one per slab/5' section)

- Vertical displacement across >50% sidewalk or >2" in height
- Horizontal displacement greater than 2% slope
- Drainage problem
- Surface deterioration or material inconsistency
- Surface spalling or cracking
- Obstruction (hydrant, utility pole or cabinet, light pole, signal pole, parking meter, bike rack, tree, sign, structure)

ADA ramp requirements:

- Detectable warning
- Ramp slope < 8.33%
- Ramp > 4'x4'
- Ramp flares' slope < 10%
- Landing slope < 2%
- Landing > 4'x4'
- Ramp lip < ¼"

We also developed a system to identify priority pedestrian routes. Our Pedestrian Potential Index (PPI) assigns points to variables that affect pedestrian travel, such as the volume of traffic and the destinations along a route. The PPI values were discussed at several NPAs and through online surveys. The PPI includes:

Variable	Code	Description	Assigned Value
Type of Road	ART	Arterial	5
	COL	Collector	3
	LCL	Local	1
Major Pedestrian Generators	ASL	W/in 0.25 mi of retirement community, assisted living, or senior center	5
	CC	W/in 0.25 mi of library, community center, places of worship, etc	3
	WK	W/in 1 mile of employment center for > 200 employees	3
	SOC	W/in 0.25 mi of community medical & social services	1
School Zones	ES	W/in 0.25 mi of elementary school	5
	MHS	W/in 0.5 mi of middle or high school	3
	UNV	W/in 1 mi of college or university	3
Transit Routes	TRN	Roads that are transit routes	5
Commercial Areas	DD	W/in Designated Downtown	5
	NAC	W/in 0.25 mi of Neighborhood Activity Center	4
Paths, Trails, & Parks	PK	W/in 0.25 mi	3
No Sidewalks on Either Side	SIDE	City policy for at least one sidewalk on every street	5

The SSP prioritizes sidewalk improvements based on an equal weight of the Deficiency Index and Pedestrian Potential Index. The combined indexes give us a Sidewalk Condition Index, which allows us to identify and prioritize the sidewalks in the worst condition, in the most heavily traveled areas.

In addition to the infrastructure assessment, the SSP development process provided information that led to our allocation of the concrete program budget to address indirect and direct sidewalk deficiencies. As a result, 10% of the budget is devoted to curb and greenbelt replacement/restoration (to help alleviate drainage, erosion, or splashing problems), 10% of the budget is devoted to sidewalk “patches” of small projects to address complaints or significant safety hazards, and 80% of the budget is devoted to long run sidewalk repair.

Sidewalk Program Annual Work Plan

Initial Implementation

Fiscal year 2010 was the first implementation of our Sidewalk Plan. We developed a 5 year work plan that anticipated replacement of 0.91 miles of sidewalk in different sections of three streets in FY10, 0.86 miles on five streets in FY2011, 0.86 miles on seven streets in FY12, 0.92 miles on five streets in

FY13, and 0.88 miles on 8 streets in FY14. Our Sidewalk Condition Index (SCI) for the sections to be replaced ranged from 82 (worst condition) to 77 (better condition). The average SCI at the beginning of the program was 55.47; after the 5 year improvements, the SCI average was expected to be 49.64.

Sidewalk System Inventory Results - 2009	
City streets	88.6 miles
City sidewalks	150.2 miles
Missing sidewalks	27 miles
Sidewalk needed to meet Transportation Plan policy to have sidewalk on one side of every street and both sides of Complete Streets	4.5 miles

Next Steps

Our Sidewalk Plan is still addressing sidewalks with an SCI of 77. Each year, we inspect the highest-ranked sidewalks to ensure they are the “worst of the worst” in the most frequently traveled areas. We have learned several things since implementing this plan in FY2010, and we have planned revisions to ensure more meaningful SCI rankings, and ultimately develop a better Sidewalk Strategic Plan.

On the positive side, we have learned that we are much more efficient with this plan’s focus and priority to replace long sections (as mentioned above, 80% of the program is devoted to long runs). We had estimated completion of 0.86 miles in FY10 but were able to repair 2.29 miles instead.

The area in need of most improvement is our Deficiency Index. We have given equal priority to all sidewalk deficiencies described on Page 1. As we developed our Sidewalk Plan, we felt that a sidewalk with a spalled surface was no better than a sidewalk with a 2” heaved corner – it needed to be replaced in either situation, for cost-effectiveness, efficiency, and safety. However, as we have inspected the “worst of the worst” in the most frequently traveled areas – as ranked by our Sidewalk Condition Index – we have seen that many of those are not, in fact, the worst. We have had to re-prioritize sidewalks on our list in every year’s work plan.

Therefore, we are planning a new sidewalk inventory for 2012. We are considering utilizing technology to assist our inventory. We will also be rewriting our Deficiency index and assigning values as we did for the Pedestrian Potential Index.

We are continuing to patch sidewalks in the worst condition, as reported through complaints from the public. In addition, we have focused a substantial amount of the program budget to Pearl Street between Winooski Avenue and Saint Paul Street, which was our one downtown sidewalk that clearly did not meet ADA requirements or general walkability initiatives; obstructions from signal poles and utility poles encroached in the sidewalk and reduced the width to less than 4’ in some sections.

Pending completion of the Pearl Street sidewalk project, we will reassess the program budget and develop a work plan for the remainder of FY2012. Our improvement list currently includes:

1. Mansfield Ave, East, from McAuley to Colchester
2. Main St, South, from St. Paul to Church
3. Maple St, North, from South Willard to Harrington

4. St. Paul St, West, from Kilburn to Marble
5. St. Paul St, East, from Spruce to Adams
6. Pearl St, North, from George to Elmwood
7. St Paul St, East, from Howard to South Union
8. Pine St, East, from Maple to Kilburn
9. South Union St, West, from College to Main
10. Main St, North, from Church to South Winooski



Office of Planning
645 Pine Street, Suite A
Burlington, VT 05402
802.863.9094 P
802.863.0466 F
802.863.0450 TTY

www.dpw.ci.burlington.vt.us

Memo

Steven Goodkind, P.E.
Director of Public Works
City Engineer

Date: November 4, 2011

To: Transportation, Energy and Utility Committee

From: Nicole Losch, Transportation Planner / Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Manager

Subject: Resolution for support of the Colchester Avenue Corridor Plan

CC: Colchester Avenue Task Force

At the October 19, 2011 meeting of the Public Works Commission, the Colchester Avenue Corridor Plan was approved. The substance and the recommendations of final plan are unchanged from the final draft that was previously present to the TEUC; some revisions were made to address comments received¹ during the comment period, which ended September 30, 2011.

The Colchester Avenue Corridor Plan is scheduled to be presented to the City Council on December 5, 2011. We have drafted a resolution for the TEUC to present at the December 5 meeting of the City Council, which clearly states the TEUC's involvement in and support of this Plan.

¹ Colchester Avenue Corridor Plan Comments on the Draft Report

Resolution Relating to

Colchester Avenue Corridor Plan

Sponsors: Councilors Wright, Brennan, and Hartnett

In the year Two Thousand Eleven.....
Resolved by the City Council of the City of Burlington, as follows:

WHEREAS, Colchester Avenue is a major arterial that connects Burlington with areas to the north and east and provides access to the hill institutions, area neighborhoods and residences, and businesses along the corridor; and

WHEREAS, the Colchester Avenue Task Force (hereafter Task Force) was created by the City Council in 2004, facilitated by the Campus Area Transportation Management Association (CATMA), and included Ward 1 NPA members, Burlington Planning & Zoning, Burlington Police Department, Burlington Public Works, Burlington Electric Department, City of Winooski, Chittenden County Transportation Authority (CCTA), Local Motion, American Red Cross, Fletcher Allen Health Care, University of Vermont Administration, University of Vermont Student Body, and CATMA; and

WHEREAS, in 2006 the Task Force published a list of objectives and recommendations for short-term and long-term goals to improve Colchester Avenue, including pedestrian and vehicle circulation, transit, bicycling, safety and lighting, signage, and aesthetics; and

WHEREAS, in 2008 the Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee approved authorized a corridor study of Colchester Avenue through the Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization; and

WHEREAS, in 2009 the Task Force began facilitation of the Colchester Avenue Corridor Study and created a technical review committee which also included the Burlington Fire Department and University of Vermont Campus Planning; and

WHEREAS, the Burlington Transportation Plan was drafted and approved by the Public Works Commission in 2007 and adopted by the City Council in April 2011, is organized around three themes: 1) Strong and Healthy City, 2) Transportation Choices, and 3) Great Streets; and

WHEREAS, under the Great Streets theme Colchester Avenue is envisioned as a *Complete Street*, which is designed to accommodate safe access for all users, to include pedestrians, bicyclists, transit vehicles and riders, and people traveling in motor vehicles; and

WHEREAS, the Colchester Avenue Corridor Plan's vision for Colchester Avenue was built from the objectives developed by the Task Force in 2006 and the Burlington Transportation Plan:

Colchester Avenue will evolve into a "Complete Streets" corridor that promotes safe, comfortable, and convenient travel for all users – including motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, and public transportation riders.

Mobility of through traffic will be balanced with accessibility to neighborhoods and local businesses as well as the Institutions on the "Hill."

The corridor will develop into an attractive public space through streetscape and site design features. It will become more livable and desirable and will serve as a welcoming gateway to Burlington.

WHEREAS, the Colchester Avenue Corridor Plan presents a transportation plan for Colchester Avenue, evaluates existing and future corridor conditions, articulates the vision and goals for the corridor, develops and compares design options and other recommendations, and offers a detailed implementation plan; and

WHEREAS, the Colchester Avenue Corridor Plan recommends further evaluation for roadway improvements to include:

- For the western corridor section (Prospect Street to East Avenue), the *Three Lane Option* with advanced pedestrian signal phasing;
- For the eastern corridor section (East Avenue to Riverside Avenue), the two-lane cross section with bike lanes, on-street parking at strategic locations, intermittent green strips, and continuous sidewalks;

WHEREAS, the Colchester Avenue Corridor Plan recommends further evaluation for intersection improvements to include:

- At Prospect Street / Pearl Street, a realignment that would create more greenspace adjacent to the UVM Green but would place the roadway and sidewalk closer to the UHC building at the southwest corner;
- At University Place, street closure to through traffic;
- At Mansfield Avenue, an exclusive left turn lane for eastbound vehicles into Mansfield;
- At Mary Fletcher Drive, an exclusive left turn lane for westbound vehicles into Mary Fletcher Drive;
- At East Avenue / Trinity Drive, a realignment of East Avenue to the west;
- At Riverside Avenue / Barrett Street / Mill Street, a consolidation from three intersections into one signalized intersection; and

WHEREAS, input from the general public was gathered at three public meetings, where the first meeting focused on the existing issues and short-term recommendations, the second on the vision and goals and the long-term design options, and the draft Corridor Plan was presented and the final meeting; and

WHEREAS, input from the Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee (TEUC) of the City Council was gathered at several meetings between 2009 and 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Public Works Commission approved the Colchester Avenue Corridor Plan at their meeting of October nineteen two thousand eleven; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee of the City Council has reviewed and supports the Colchester Avenue Corridor Study recommendations that taken together will achieve the corridor vision; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Department of Public Works will continue to evaluate individual recommendations of the Colchester Avenue Corridor Plan and will present findings and recommendations to the TEUC, Public Works Commission, and City Council as appropriate, and in cooperation with the Colchester Avenue Task Force and area residents and businesses.



Office of Planning
645 Pine Street, Suite A
Burlington, VT 05402
802.863.9094 P
802.863.0466 F
802.863.0450 TTY

www.dpw.ci.burlington.vt.us

Memo

Steven Goodkind, P.E.
Director of Public Works
City Engineer

Date: November 4, 2011

To: Transportation, Energy and Utility Committee

From: Nicole Losch, Transportation Planner / Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Manager

Subject: Resolution for support of 25 mph Citywide Speed Limit

CC: Burlington Public Works Commission

At the October 19, 2011 meeting of the Public Works Commission, the 25 mph citywide speed limit was approved. The approval was unchanged from the citywide speed limit recommendations previously presented to the TEUC, with the exception of the 20 mph slow streets; this was not approved but will be revisited at a later date.

After consulting Council President Bill Keogh to determine the most ideal process, we have drafted a resolution for the TEUC to present at the December 5, 2011 meeting of the City Council. This will allow us to close the loop on City Council's initial direction to study a lower citywide speed limit and to inform all councilors of the impending speed limit change.

Resolution Relating to

Citywide 25 mile per hour Speed Limit

Sponsors: Councilors Wright, Brennan, and Hartnett

In the year Two Thousand Eleven.....
Resolved by the City Council of the City of Burlington, as follows:

WHEREAS, the City’s vision is an interconnected transportation system with a range of choices competing with the automobile for the dominant mode choice; and

WHEREAS, City Council expressed a desire to improve the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists through a resolution in the year two thousand, which directed the Public Works Commission, in cooperation with the Police Department, to study the feasibility of lowering the speed limits on all Burlington streets, excluding the Northern Connector; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Public Works (DPW) studied the feasibility of lowering the speed limits on all Burlington streets through the development of the Burlington Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Burlington Transportation Plan acknowledged

1. the topic of appropriate speed limits was a mentioned frequently in public meetings as well as the Pedestrian Summit of the year two thousand six; and
2. in order to create the safe pedestrian environment that is desirable for neighborhood streets the City should adopt a citywide speed limit of twenty-five miles per hour (mph) for all streets not otherwise posted; and

WHEREAS, the DPW studied street design and associated speeds and identified streets to be posted at speeds other than twenty-five mph, presented recommendations to the Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee (TEUC) of the City Council and Public Works Commission; and

WHEREAS, the streets to be posted at speeds other than twenty-five mph were identified based on existing regulations defining speeds other than thirty or twenty-five mph and/or their status for future *Complete Streets* corridor studies and corresponding detailed speed limit studies; and

WHEREAS, the TEUC considered the DPW recommendations for lower citywide speed limits and provided input for the Public Works Commission consideration; and

WHEREAS, on September twenty-eight of year two thousand eleven the Public Works Commission hosted a public hearing to obtain feedback on a lower citywide speed limit; and

WHEREAS, at their October nineteen two thousand eleven, the Public Works Commission, after consideration of the DPW recommendations, TEUC input, and public comments, approved a twenty-five mph citywide speed limit, excluding:

1. Plattsburg Avenue,
2. North Avenue between Plattsburg and the Route 127 entrance/exit ramps,
3. Shelburne Street from the South Burlington town line to the intersection of Ledge Road / Locust Street,
4. Northern Connector,
5. Church Street, and
6. Lake Street; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee of the City Council reviewed the proposed citywide speed limit and concurs with the Public Works Commission; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the DPW staff will continue to evaluate lower speed limits in the Transportation Plan's "Slow Streets" corridor and will continue to present findings and recommendations to the TEUC and Public Works Commission, in cooperation with the Burlington Police Department.